UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,766	06/02/2006	Michael H. Bracey	TSRI 923.1	8883
2387 Olson & Cepuri	7590 12/16/200 itis, LTD.	EXAMINER		
20 NORTH WA	ACKER DRIVE	STEADMAN, DAVID J		
36TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/534,766	BRACEY ET AL.			
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	David J. Steadman	1656			
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>afte</u>	r final rejection			
(1) <u>David J. Steadman</u> .	(3)				
(2) Robert J. Ross.	(4)				
Date of Interview: <u>11 December 2009</u>	Time: approximately 11:30	<u>AM</u>			
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)				
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed:					
Claims discussed:					
Prior art documents discussed: Hanson					
Part II.					
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet					
Part III.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview			
(A ₁	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A voice mail was left with Mr. Ross on 12/11/09. The examiner noted that the Declarations of Dunn and Gruenwald filed on 11/25/09 provide evidence that the Hanson reference was available as prior art as early as February 2003 and it would appear that the prior-filed provisional application 60/426,788, filed on 11/14/02, would need to be relied on to antedate the Hanson reference. The examiner noted that the limitations of claim 1 could not be located in the disclosure of the prior-filed provisional application and requested Mr. Ross's assistance in locating those limitations in order to expedite review of the application. As of 12/15/09, no response to the examiner's inquiry has been received.